



KABATA

# KNIK ARM CROSSING

DOT&PF



## Meeting Notes

Subject Interdisciplinary Team Meeting

Sheet 1 of 13

Project Number 21132

Meeting Date July 14, 2005

Meeting Location 4<sup>th</sup> Floor Conference Room

Notes by Terry McConnell

Office Anchorage

Attendees: See List Below

Topics Discussed	Comments Received	Purpose and Need	Screening Criteria
Greg Schmidt	3CES/CEVP (Elmendorf AFB)		
Ken Walter	3WG (Elmendorf AFB)		
Mark Fink	Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADF&G)		
Marcie Menefee	Alaska Department of Natural Resources (ADNR)		
Don Perrin	Alaska Department of Natural Resources (ADNR)		
Mark Somerville	Alaska Department of Natural Resources, Office of Habitat Management and Permitting (ADNR/OHMP)		
Jo Antonson	Alaska Department of Natural Resources, State Historic Preservation Office (ADNR, SHPO)		
Doug Gaser	Alaska Department of Natural Resources, State Historic Preservation Office (ADNR, SHPO)		
Kim Rice	Alaska Department of Transportation and Public Facility (DOT&PF)		
Barb Hotchkin	Alaska Railroad Corporation (ARRC)		
Paul Curtis	Alaskan Command (ALCOM)		
James Spell	Alaskan Command (ALCOM)		
Rodney Huffman	Bureau of Land Management (BLM)		
Murph O'Brien	Matanuska Susitna Borough (MSB)		
Tom Nelson	Municipality of Anchorage (MOA)		
Schawna Thoma	Municipality of Anchorage (MOA)		
Barbara Mahoney	National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS)		
Skip Joy	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE)		
Leroy Phillips	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE)		
Heather Dean	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)		
Elaine Somers	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)		
Phil Brna	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)		
Edrie Vinson	Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)		
William Greene	Knik Arm Bridge and Toll Authority / Department of Transportation and Public Facility, Attorney General (KABATA/DOT&PF, AG)		
Dale Paulson	Knik Arm Bridge and Toll Authority / Department of Transportation and Public Facility (KABATA/DOT&PF)		
Louise Smart	CDR Associates		
Rosetta Alcantra	HDR Alaska		



## Meeting Notes

Bill	Chopyk	HDR Alaska
Kevin	Doyle	HDR Alaska
Duane	Hippe	HDR Alaska
Terry	McConnell	HDR Alaska
John	McPherson	HDR Alaska
Robin	Reich	HDR Alaska
Paul	Kendall	PND
Doug	Kenley	PND
Lindsey	Holmes	RISE Alaska
Rich	Stern	Stephen R. Braund and Associates (SRBA)
Steve	Brady	True Nature Interactive
Karen	Brown	URS Corporation
Jack	Colonell	URS Corporation
Jim	Glaspell	URS Corporation
Jon	Isaacs	URS Corporation
Lisa	Loy Gray	URS Corporation
Robin	Senner	URS Corporation

*Lunchtime Open House Visit Poster Stations*

*Louise Smart (CDR) Welcome*

*Introductions around the room*

*Edrie Vinson (FHWA) Project Overview*

The Notice of Intent went out in January. We have received feedback on purpose and need, screening criteria, and studies. We are now getting ready to screen alternatives down to the reasonable range of alternatives to be analyzed in the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). We are close to wrapping up the formal scoping process and completing the scoping report.

*Robin Reich (HDR) Scoping Comments Received and How They Have Been Addressed*

We have conducted a number of activities to involve agencies in the scoping process. We have had one-on-one meetings to introduce the project and cover special topics. We have 23 Interdisciplinary Team agencies involved in the scoping process. Right now we have 14 formal Cooperating Agencies and 9 informal cooperating agencies. If you don't see your agency up here (listed in presentation), or think you are in the wrong category, let us know. We have created a database that includes about 770 comments received. We have a topic summary to categorize the comments and our responses.

We received about 100 comments on project alternatives. These comments were related to how we developed alternatives, what we think are the reasonable alternatives, and the proposed screening criteria we would like to use. In response to these comments, we are taking a longer and harder look at the alternatives. We have added more corridor concepts, including one on top of the bluff, a few through the military bases, and another alignment



## Meeting Notes

through Port MacKenzie. We are considering other modes of crossing like ferries and commuter rail in more detail. We are also, considering a completely pile supported crossing.

We received about 85 comments related to beluga whales. Agencies voiced concerns regarding potential impacts to the whales and provided input into the study plan. Agencies, mainly NOAA Fisheries, have provided background information and information on the incidental take authorization. In response to the comments on beluga whales, we will continue to work closely with NOAA Fisheries. FHWA and KABATA decided to extend the beluga whale study from 5 months to 1 year. FHWA and KABATA also authorized work to gather under water sound data on pile driving at Port MacKenzie. The team has been developing avoidance and mitigation measures. We have started to prepare documentation for incidental take authorization. We have also been investigating other crossing alternatives.

We received about 85 comments on Knik Arm fisheries, particularly salmon. These comments were related to the study plan design, potential impact the project could have on the fisheries and shoreline. Agencies recommended we expand the fish field study to collect a year of data. We were encouraged to gather information on other fish and non-fish species in the Arm in addition to information gathered on anadromous fish. We were asked to consider using mid-channel tow netting in addition to beach seining. We are working to determine the entry timing of juvenile salmon into Knik Arm, and to find out how long they stay and where, and their size and growth during residence. We were asked to consider using hydroacoustics to determine fish use of Knik Arm, and to conduct stomach analysis, and to use radio tagging for tracking the seasonal presence of certain species. .. We were encouraged to look at other places where causeways have been used to help develop a design for the embankment. In response to all of the input, we extended the fish field work study period, added tow netting, and added more sampling periods in the spring time. We are sharing information with NOAA Fisheries, and reporting the findings of the fish fieldwork on a regular basis. We will begin to draft the Essential Fish Habitat assessment once the fieldwork is done at the end of the month, and will share this with NOAA Fisheries in advance of the draft EIS. Right now we are investigating literature to determine how well re-created shorelines work for fish passage.

We received approximately 70 comments on purpose and need for the project with a number of recommendations. It was recommended that we include reference to all modes of surface transportation as part of the regional transportation infrastructure system. We were told the crossing is not necessary for military deployment, and that funding for the project cannot be considered under purpose and need. We were told there should be discussion of MSB's multi-use ferry/rescue vessel project. The Port MacKenzie area should be defined. Port MacKenzie is zoned industrial and commercial within the port district and would not be available for residential development. We heard that further support for a future rail route across Knik Arm is supported by the MSB as documented in the "Matanuska-Susitna Road Rail Corridor Study." Our response has been to update the purpose and need, which Kevin will talk about in more detail in a few minutes.



## Meeting Notes

We received approximately 55 comments on permitting. In general, we heard that six months for permitting (between draft and final document) will be a very tough schedule for agencies to meet. In response to input, the KABATA and ADNR have developed an agreement to compensate ADNR departments for their work on the Knik Arm Crossing EIS and permitting. The team has committed to drafting permit applications that include all information necessary for approval. Draft permit applications will be provided for comments before they are submitted. The process for permitting will be comment/revise/comment/revise. Hopefully this will eliminate any surprises from the final permit applications.

We received approximately 50 comments about agency involvement. We were given the staff contacts for the agencies involved with this project. We then developed a comprehensive mailing list as well as an email list. We also initiated draft agreements with some formally cooperating agencies.

There were approximately 40 comments on indirect (secondary) and cumulative impacts of the project and how they should be studied. We heard concern for the impacts associated with indirect and cumulative development. We were told cumulative impacts associated with the project are the most significant and difficult issues which must be addressed in the EIS. We also heard that the EIS should discuss the potential to mitigate cumulative impacts through some type of cooperative land use or watershed planning effort in the MSB, and that potential for mitigation banking should be investigated. We heard the EIS should identify and describe potential direct and indirect project effects on freshwater aquatic habitats, including wetlands, streams, and lakes, especially in the MSB. There were also concerns with the likelihood of Anchorage International Airport (Ted Stevens AIA) moving to the valley and plans for Port MacKenzie development. The input we received on methods was mainly related to resource components. It was recommended that the EIS include an assessment of drinking water supplies and drinking water quality in the MSB to inform the public and decision makers regarding reasonably foreseeable growth. It is an additional factor in comparing alternatives.

The input on RFFAs (Reasonable Foreseeable Future Actions) included comments about a cargo airport, the railroad corridor to Willow, and concern over unrestricted fishing. It was noted that once the crossing is in place, it will be a quick trip to the Little Susitna River fishery, which is the biggest coho salmon producer in North Cook Inlet and West Cook Inlet.

In response to comment related to indirect and cumulative impacts, we acknowledged that indirect and cumulative impacts are one of the biggest challenges with this project. We changed our methods and have added drinking water quantity and quality to the resource components to analyze in the indirect and cumulative effects. We added an office assessment of well water quantity and quality to the study plan, and we amended list of RFFAs.

We received approximately 30 comments on existing land use in the MSB, and how the project could change land use. In regards to Mat-Su existing and future land use you said you were interested in where and how the crossing will intersect the Port MacKenzie District. The



## Meeting Notes

Transportation system on the Mat-Su side is limited, so you wanted to see other concepts. WE also heard that the MSB is interested in the results of the land use and transportation implementation plan relative to land use requirements and infrastructure needs relative to the MSB side. Regarding Anchorage area land use, we received comments about Elmendorf AFB, Port of Anchorage (POA), and Government Hill. We were told to avoid development in the Ship Creek area because there is not enough space. We heard the project should coordinate with ARRC regarding project impacts on ARRC's leased parcels in Government Hill and its 600-acre Anchorage Terminal Reserve in the Ship Creek area. We were told no crossing alternative should be implemented until land use planning, zoning and necessary community services are in place, and that planning should be a major component of mitigation for the proposed project. We have responded to these comments by working with the MSB to define land use requirements, infrastructure, and transportation needs. We are also working with the military to define land use, areas that are "off limits," and areas that would be suited to accommodate approaches. We are open to working with any and all landowners to determine potential impacts. Of course, all potential impacts to land use will be detailed in the EIS.

We received approximately 25 comments about hydrology and sedimentation. There were concerns about the potential changes to currents and sedimentation patterns in the Arm related to the crossing. We heard that the bridge could impact tidal flow and sediment transport. We heard that there needs to be a sediment transport and distribution study. It was expressed that it seems necessary to pursue three dimensional modeling to determine the hydrological impacts of the project related to fill and embankments. In response, we acknowledge that sedimentation is a concern and have been meeting with the COE to discuss the issue and its study. A numerical model of the hydraulics in Knik Arm supported by additional oceanographic field studies is underway. The report from this effort will summarize where sedimentation would be expected for each project alternative. While we acknowledge that certain features of Knik Arm hydrodynamics might require a three-dimensional hydrodynamic model for their complete analysis, we have determined that the potential environmental impacts due to a bridge crossing are adequately addressed within the capabilities of a two-dimensional model. For purposes of calibrating and verifying this model, we are also undertaking additional collection of oceanographic and sedimentary data within Knik Arm this summer.

We received approximately 25 comments on potential impacts to cultural and historical sites and how they should be studied. For Section 106 (of the National Historic Preservation Act), we are looking at where the project would be constructed and at the road to and from the proposed bridge. We heard indirect and cumulative impacts to historic properties is a concern and that historic preservation planning is needed. In response, we are working closely with SHPO and tribal members. We are updating the SHPO on field efforts. We have started an effort to assist the MSB and Municipality of Anchorage with historic preservation planning.



## Meeting Notes

There were approximately 25 comments on military issues related to the project. Regarding purpose and need, the military said “We do not want to imply that the military has a requirement for a bridge, because we do not.” We received feedback about approach corridor options and constraints. They stated that there is a lot of expansion going on, so we don't want to restrict military access, but we are still listening to proposals. We have responded by removing reference to military need from the purpose and need. We will be working closely with the military on corridor options. Doug will go over some of the corridors that have been developed a bit later.

We received approximately 20 comments on transportation issues including the need to avoid existing congestion areas like the POA and Ship Creek area. We were asked to look at potential impacts to road networks in the MSB and Anchorage. It was suggested that the project consider studying traffic impacts in the Ship Creek area in light of future projects like the MSB ferry and ARRC Intermodal facility. Also we heard that Port MacKenzie is part of an industrial road network. We have responded by developing a traffic model that will help us determine where traffic issues would occur, where improvements would be needed, and the logical termini for the project.

There were approximately 20 comments regarding potential hazardous waste sites and related issues. We were told there is an area wide petroleum hydrocarbon contamination plume all over the tank farm area. There is also a landfill along the bluff as well as a potential area of unexploded ordnance on the Port MacKenzie side. In response, we will be looking how to avoid these sites or build through them. We are working with the ADEC and COE to gather background information. We are also mapping known and potential sites to determine the location of alternatives to these sites. Once this is determined, we will work closely with the agencies to determine how to move forward.

We received approximately 10 comments on potential impacts to birds, including shorebirds, waterfowl, and raptors, and the need to survey bird use of the project area. We heard input from you on not making any crossing attractive to bird use because of safety issues with aircraft (mainly on Base). We also received a lot of information on bird populations and types you might find in the project area. To respond, we have initiated a field study of bird use of the project area. The fieldwork methods have been reviewed by the USFWS, USGS, and other bird experts in Anchorage. This effort involves surveys for birds about 2 days a week on both sides of the Inlet. We will look into how to make a crossing structure uninviting to birds with ways to keep birds from perching on it.

There were approximately 10 comments on the POA and its future activities. We were asked to look at alternatives through the port and potential impacts to the port (onshore and offshore) especially related to sedimentation. To respond, we will continue to work with the port as the project moves forward with alternatives development. We are developing corridor options that avoid the POA. Doug will explain more about this later. Regarding sedimentation, we



## Meeting Notes

are developing a numeric model of hydraulics in Knik Arm to determine whether and where we would expect to see sedimentation with different crossing alternatives.

We received approximately 10 comments on preliminary engineering (or project design) including in-water design concerns and questions about construction methods, quantities and types of materials needed. There were more questions than comments including “How would the project be constructed?” “How much area would be needed for construction staging area?” “How much fill or pilings would be needed?” In response to these comments, we are working on narrowing down alternatives based on screening criteria. Once this is completed, we will develop more detailed engineering information, which will be provided to those that have asked questions. It will also be reported in the draft EIS.

We had approximately 10 comments on potential impacts to freshwater wetlands. We heard that impacts to wetlands should be avoided, minimized and mitigated. We heard that indirect and cumulative impacts to wetlands in the MSB is an issue. In response, once reasonable alternatives have been developed, we will be going out in the field to map wetlands along corridors. We will determine wetland boundaries, which will help us work toward, as is practical, avoiding and minimizing impacts. We will use NWI (National Wetland Inventory) mapping to determine wetland areas outside the foot print of the project. The Plan Builder modeling will help us determine potential impacts by indirect and cumulative development. We will document wetland types and boundaries and potential impacts in a wetland technical memorandum. We will also document methods used to avoid, minimize, and mitigate impacts.

There were a number of other comments on a variety of topics. There were approximately 5 comments each on the following topics: air quality, marine navigation, mitigation measures, tribal involvement, and terrestrial mammals. To respond we will be conducting air quality modeling to meet the guideline of EPA and FHWA. We are developing a marine navigation memo to document marine vessel use of Knik Arm. We will be developing and sharing mitigation measures as we move forward with the project. We have been and will continue to involve tribal governments in the process to meet the Executive Order on government to government relationships, the Millennium Order, and FHWA guidance. Finally, we have been and will continue to gather existing information regarding terrestrial mammals (mainly moose and bears) and will continue to consult with the agencies involved.

*Jamie Spell (ALCOM)*

We primarily hear about moose and bear on the Mat-Su side. Why not on the Anchorage side?

*Greg Schmidt (3CES/CEVP)*

Wildlife corridors and moose habitat must be maintained because of the Sykes Act.

*Kevin Doyle (HDR) Final Draft Statement of Purpose and Need*



## Meeting Notes

We have received good comments regarding purpose and need. We have heard what purpose and need should not include. We are close to a final draft of the purpose and need briefly described on the green handout. We have gone back to the basics where the key is to “further” develop the transportation system. This purpose and need came from the existing local and state plans listed on the blue handout. These plans support a Knik Arm Crossing. Essentially, the purpose of the Knik Arm Crossing project is to “further the development of transportation systems in the Upper Cook Inlet region by providing vehicular access and surface transportation connectivity between the Municipality of Anchorage and the Matanuska Susitna Borough (MSB), at the Port MacKenzie District, with a financially feasible and efficient crossing to meet the needs for 1) Improved regional transportation infrastructure to meet existing and projected population growth and locally adopted economic development, land use, and transportation plans, and as directed by the Alaska State Legislature in Alaska Statutes chapter 19.75; 2) Regional transportation connectivity for the movement of people and the movement of freight and goods to, from, and distribution between Anchorage, the Mat-Su Borough, and interior Alaska; and 3) Safety and transportation system redundancy for alternative travel routing and access between regional airports, ports, military bases, hospitals, and fire, police and disaster relief services for emergency response and evacuation.” The intent of this purpose and need is to be complementary to existing plans.

*Louise Smart (CDR)*

Please indicate with thumbs up, down or sideways whether this is right on track (up), unsure or need more information (sideways), or causes major problems for you (down).

(Meeting attendee showed no thumbs down, many sideways, and some up.)

*Louise Smart (CDR)*

Let’s go around the room and discuss the thumbs down or sideways.

*Don Perrin (ADNR)*

We need information on availability of single family housing land on the Mat-Su side. The statement about “affordable land” needs to be supported.

*John McPherson (HDR)*

We have started to put that information into the model.

*Jamie Spell (ALCOM)*

The word “military” appears in one of your “need” statements. That may need to be looked at more closely.

*Murph O’Brien (MSB)*

Termini on the Mat-Su side needs to be determined, along with completion of the transportation modeling so there is not unintended meaning with the word “vicinity” of Port MacKenzie.



## Meeting Notes

*Tom Nelson (MOA)*

I see a big improvement on the purpose and need since the last version. I have concerns about #1 Purpose and Need Screening Criteria. (Would further the development of transportation in Upper Cook Inlet by providing improved vehicular access and surface transportation connectivity between the MOA and the MSB at the Port MacKenzie District). There are a whole range of costs that need to be considered. There are a lot of unknown factors pertaining to growth and housing markets that must be fleshed out.

*Rodney Huffman (BLM)*

Regarding #3 (Redundancy), the Mat-Su now has a new hospital. Also, in bad weather, a bridge can actually be an unsafe place to be. You may want to make that piece stronger.

*Elaine Somers (EPA)*

You said the ports want access to the north. Can you clarify that statement?

*Kevin Doyle (HDR)*

We are thinking that the POA wants easier access to the Interior Alaska.

*Murph O'Brien (MSB)*

The Mat-Su Borough has always said that the Crossing should be connected in the vicinity of Port MacKenzie.

*Phil Brna (USFWS)*

Do you really gain anything by getting to Fairbanks 45 minutes sooner?

*Murph O'Brien (MSB)*

Yes. Commercial traffic would save about two hours and that is huge.

Break

*Kevin Doyle (HDR) Alternatives Development and Screening Process*

We are in the second phase of scoping, working on distilling down the range of alternatives to the alternatives that will be considered in the EIS. We will be screening using the purpose and need criteria and technical screening criteria to determine the big picture flaws and whether an alternative passes the criteria. We will begin with the modes of travel, roadway, ferry, and rail. We have been asked to look at ferry and rail modes with a big picture view. They can be complementary modes to a Knik Arm Crossing. Within the roadway mode, we look at various roadway corridors and approaches. Once the screening criteria have been applied, alignments will be determined which will then be distilled down to the reasonable alternatives including a no-action alternative. The Knik Arm Crossing project is being proposed as a part of an intermodal regional transportation network including roads, bridges,



## Meeting Notes

railroads, airports, marine vessels, ferries and ports. All of these modes are important and meet specific needs.

*Don Perrin (ADNR)*

Is there a need to apply agency and public scoping comments to screening criteria?

*Kevin Doyle (HDR)*

That is something we need to look at in more detail.

*Elaine Somers (EPA)*

Again it says “vehicle” (as in vehicular access).

*Kevin Doyle (HDR)*

The primary purpose of this project is to provide vehicular access. However, we are not going to reject alternatives based on this. Ferry and rail can both accommodate vehicles.

*Barb Hotchkin (ARRC)*

Some screening alternatives seem to be a question of scale. It doesn't appear that those will screen out alternatives effectively.

*Kevin Doyle (HDR)*

There are other criteria that will be applied like “efficient movement” of traffic and “financially feasible.”

*Doug Kenley (PND) Corridor Options*

We have some new corridors to show you (reference the PowerPoint presentation). On the Mat-Su side, there are two corridors we are studying. With one corridor, the Point MacKenzie Road Corridor, the Crossing would connect directing into the existing Port MacKenzie Road. Another corridor we are considering is the Northern Access Corridor. For this corridor, the Crossing would connect into a new road that would run north around the Port MacKenzie District.

We are looking at two corridors across Knik Arm. The Perpendicular Alignment would cross Knik Arm in a nearly perpendicular fashion. It would connect from south of Anderson Dock on the Mat-Su Side to the Anchorage corridors north of Green Lake Creek. Another corridor, the Skewed Alignment, would cross Knik Arm from south of Anderson Dock to south of Greek Lake Creek on the Anchorage Side.

In Anchorage, we are studying Below the Bluff Corridors, Above the Bluff Corridors, a Post Road/Reeve Blvd Corridor; a Boniface Parkway Corridor; a Muldoon Road Corridor, and a Hiland Road Corridor.



## Meeting Notes

The Below the Bluff Corridors include four variants: The variants are the: West Bluff Drive Corridor Variant; Erickson Street Corridor Variant; Elmendorf Corridor Variant; and the Ingra/Gambell Street Corridor Variant.

The Above the Bluff Corridors include four variants. These variants are the: West Bluff Drive Variant; Erickson Variant; Elmendorf Variant; and the Ingra/Gambell 2003 Variant.

*Jamie Spell (ALCOM)*

Have you looked at an elevated causeway through the port?

*Doug Kenley (PND)*

We have looked at that. There are two teams looking independently at seismic issues. There is a lot of geotechnical information available in the crossing corridor, so we are confident a safe structure can be built. On the Anchorage approach corridors we show various termini. One connects to West Bluff Drive. Another connects at Erickson Street. There are several variations of Elmendorf corridors. And finally we show an Ingra/Gambell connection.

*Edrie Vinson (FHWA)* Jamie, when will we know about the status of the (Circularly Disposed Antenna Array [CDAA]) antenna?

*Jamie Spell (ALCOM)*

The earliest we will make a decision about whether the antenna (CDAA) will remain or go away will be by 2008. If it doesn't go away, any corridor above the ridge has a fatal flaw because it impacts the defense mission. There is a one mile buffer around the antenna that forbids construction. Routes below the bluff could also have construction constraints. If the antenna does not go away, the above the bluff routes won't happen.

*Paul Curtis (ALCOM)*

We can provide a written statement to that effect.

*Skip Joy (COE)*

Is there a 3 mile constraint for the ammunition dump?

*Jamie Spell (ALCOM)*

No, it is not 3 miles.

*Kevin Doyle (HDR)*

The process of creating lines on a map was based on previous studies and determinations like the 1984 Draft EIS. Those studies determined the Boniface route was not feasible and there were constraints going through military land and the port. Through our scoping process, the Government Hill Community Council gave input that they want the project to avoid their community. They want the approaches to go through military land instead.



## Meeting Notes

*Barb Mahoney (NMFS)*

We have concerns about beluga to the north in Eagle Bay. How does Hiland Road meet the screening criteria?

*Kevin Doyle (HDR)*

The Hiland Road Corridor is on the limits of “reasonableness” for alternatives. It is substantially out of the direction most people would want to go. It was evaluated previously as part of POA north access and determined to be not feasible because the use of military land was unacceptable. Our next steps will involve applying the screening process to identify reasonable alternatives. It sounds like we just heard a fatal flaw from the military related to the circular antenna and all the routes above the bluff. The travel demand model is nearly complete. It will be a tool for screening route suitability. AMATS has concern about placing large traffic volume at Boniface Parkway. It may not be compatible with the planned highway-to-highway connection.

*Jamie Spell (ALCOM)*

Regarding a ferry system, could the terminus be at the airport with other stops along Ship Creek or somewhere else?

*Kevin Doyle (HDR)*

Our travel model will help us determine land use and issues like that.

*Edrie Vinson (FHWA)*

The next steps are going to require a lot of work. We don’t know when the “in development” work will be completed so we won’t schedule our next meeting right now.

*Elaine Somers (EPA)*

There might need to be more conversations about using scoping comments to develop more criteria.

*Kevin Doyle (HDR)*

Yes, we want to do that as a check.

*Edrie Vinson (FHWA)*

Please send feedback about minor things by mail or email. We will meet again when we have major items.

*Barbara Mahoney (NMFS)*

I would like to see LGL’s August Beluga Whale report before you decide to restrict alternatives.

*Tom Nelson (MOA)*



## Meeting Notes

I have concerns about how #6 Purpose and Need Screening Criteria about local plans may be applied. At best, AMATS recommended a feasibility study for a Knik Arm Crossing.

*Louise Smart (CDR)*

There will be a separate one-on-one meeting to talk about that. Please fill out the questionnaire included with the agenda packet. Each agency will get a matrix of the agency comments and responses. August 12 is the due date for written comments about the range of alternatives and screening criteria.

Meeting Adjourned